

Water Quality Advisory Group  
December 8, 1999  
Room 1319  
**Minutes**

Board members present:

John Fekete, Bill Beranek, Ron Wukasch, Rae Schnapp, Tom Anderson, John Wilkins, Bowden Quinn, Tom McKenna, Senator Beverly Gard, Lori Kaplan, Tim Method, Matt Rueff and Mayor Margerum.

Audience:

Melanie Darke, Peter Beronio, Bob Johnson, Miriam Dant, Eric Fry, Charlotte Read, Phyllis Hockett, Mary Uhler, Maggie McShane, Jane Dustin, Tom Dustin, Tonya Galbraith, Patrick Barrett, Scott Schutte, Vince Griffin and Len Ashack.

John F: Thank you for attending.

Lori: The feedback I have received has been positive. This group has been very productive. I'm asking the group to continue and address other issues it originally set out to answer. Can we continue to meet for the next four months?

Mayor Margerum: Agree

Senator Gard: Agree. We do need to expedite a couple of the issues.

John W: Agree

Bowden: Agree

Lori: Then we will continue on the same day. Thank you for your hard work.

John F: We need to review the draft report and next steps. Tonya has information on wet weather legislation from the last meeting. This information has been provided from the Wet Weather Technical Group.

Tonya: Review of preliminary draft wet weather legislation.

Senator Gard: Should change name to CSO.

John F: Maybe not the best time to bring this up for discussion.

Tonya: We will have this out for comment.

John F: In Section 4, July 1, 2000 - emergency clause.

Senator Gard: Need specific language.

Bill: The word "temporary" is a problem. Temporary - seven year period. We are looking for a long term control plan.

Tonya: After review, feel free to contact her with comments.

Senator Gard: We need a limited time frame for comments.

John F: We will need comments within a week.

Senator Gard: Deadline for filing bills is January 7, 2000. We must submit new information to LSA by December 22, 1999.

Rae: Why change surface water to incorporate CSO?

Bill: This isn't meant to be temporary. We are coming at the same thing but could be written better.

Rae: Suspending standards - why taking in CSO's?

Tonya: We are just trying to get to the same objective. We need suggestions on how you would craft

this better.

Bill: I'm happy to help.

Tom: Pretreatment program - where is EPA's authority?

Len: That is a grey area - permits are written - we have approval authority for some of the sewer ordinances.

John F: I would like to call attention to the draft report. We have outlined issues we discussed earlier and have laid out the program to discuss these issues.

- Review of draft report - policy concept for OSRW.

Bill: The OSRW's currently designated and future designations will not have the no degradation criteria. OSRW - would have policy that if you did increase discharge which would be regulated by state rule, then you would have to do something else to improve water quality. No discharge allowed if it would impair water body. Net environmental improvement - make a straight trade. IDEM would approve project that would have net environmental improvement with public participation. Dollars relative to discharge into net environmental improvement fund. This group is not endorsing any of these ideas specifically. Rulemaking process can review these ideas.

John F: Six waterbodies already designated remain.

Mayor Margerum: How would we measure the trade-off.

Bill: State does allow dollars to do testing. Do have TMDL's for all waters.

Ron: What if it is a large project - will bring a lot with non-point source runoff.

Bill: That is a question - how do we handle non-point source? Backing into it with TMDL process. This is framework - it is a start.

John F: Objective 1B - we left that open and it has a sense of urgency. Smaller groups putting this information together.

Rae: Small groups have addressed this earlier.

John F: We would like to have that information. Can you email that to us?

Jane: All OSRW's in Tier 2 waters - is that the presumption? We are working on changing that rule.

Bill: OSRW's in Tier 2 with net improvement - this group and the general assembly haven't agreed to this.

Bob: Indiana GLI rule is different than the federal GLI rule. Federal rule has some flexibility.

Bill: This group has focused on no degradation.

John F: We appreciate any input - but we cannot solve these problems today.

- Discussion on wet weather draft. Should have three objectives under wet weather.

By December 15<sup>th</sup> address the first bullet point.

Ron: Reality of sampling - water quality standards in streams not effluent. Long Term Control Plan involves a lot of modeling.

Rae: Where are we going to draw the line on the curve? Has to be tied back to water quality not just technology. Just having technology isn't enough.

Bill: Affordability with knee-of-curve. Needs to be some refinement of the Long Term Control Plan strategy.

Mayor Margerum: Can't base solely on Water Quality Standards.

Bill: Knee-of-curve implies there will be bad stuff.

John F: Should we capture site or situation specific?

Ron: When does criteria apply? Probabilistic approach - one year. Where is sampling point? There is

no protocol for water quality criteria for e coli - 236 weekly criteria in a stream?

Bill: That is the question. Permit limit has to meet the standard.

Tom: Not working toward improvement - just managing degradation.

Bill: Weekly standard rather than daily standard.

Mayor Margerum: How is permit going to read?

Rae: 235 is considered safe as daily - doesn't work for weekly average. Some are talking effluent some are talking water quality standards.

John F: Is this just wet weather or does it apply all the time?

Matt: Unique to wet weather and POTW's.

John F: Address unique and specific events. As far as our recommendation is concerned. The wet weather second to last bullet needs development.

Mayor Margerum: As long as we understand what it means - long term plan would be to make recommendations to the Water Pollution Control Board.

Matt: Develop clarification of our rule.

John F: IDEM review the standard and get back to this group.

John W: We all want relief for POTW's for e coli in wet weather events.

Bill: Need targeted standards.

John F: IDEM review implications - need clarification on language. We need to come up with recommendations by February. Key considerations by March with something by April.

Bowden: OSRW - think of Lake Michigan . Goal should be improvement of water quality for waterbodies within watershed.

Rae: Net improvement has to be measurable. If a measurable decrease - non-point sources are what we have to get at anyway.

John F: Please limit your opinions to one page. We have to focus on anti-degradation and wet weather.

Charlotte: Look at State anti-degradation policy.

Vince: Bullet one on special designations - doesn't remove all the OSRW's - did this group discuss this?

John F: In 10/22 meeting we touched on this. Language changes out by Monday at the latest. Any further comments?

We will reissue and incorporate issues for January meeting.

Bob: Keep anti-degradation on the forefront. Biocriteria and sediment doesn't show up right away.

Matt: May take a series of meetings to discuss this.

John F: In January we will review agenda's for the next several months.

Adjournment